



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,097	07/23/2003	Paul James Taysom	6647-049	8954
45842 7590 03/09/2007 MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C. - NOVELL 210 SW MORRISON STREET SUITE 400 PORTLAND, OR 97204				
			EXAMINER LY, CHEYNE D	
			ART UNIT 2168	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/626,097

Applicant(s)

TAYSOM, PAUL JAMES

Examiner

Cheyne D. Ly

Art Unit

2168

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 05 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the <sup>arguments</sup> proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: 33 and 51.  
Claim(s) rejected: 17-24, 26-32, 44-46, 48-50 and 54-71.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.

Attachment: Interview Summary

  
3/05/07

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Claims 55-59, 63-67, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is maintained with respect to claims 55-59, 63-67, and 71, as recited in the previous office action mailed December 05, 2006.

#### RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

In regard to claims 55 and 63, Applicant points to Figure 5C and page 8, lines 3-6, to provide support for the rejected limitations as being new matter. The support is not persuasive because the disclosure is directed to "contract 215 is removed from the associated contract lists of file 115" wherein said disclosure does not provide written basis support for the limitation of "a disassociation of the contract object from the second object and a delete of the contract object." The new limitation of "the second object and a delete of the contract object" is distinct from the "contract lists of file 115." Applicant further points to page 7, line 27 through page 8, line 2 to support the new limitation. However, the pointed to disclosure is directed to "the associated contracts list..."

In regard to claims 56 and 64, Applicant points to page 8, lines 23-26 to argue that "A person skilled in the art will recognize that other events can affect a contract. Applicant's argument is not persuasive because the pointed to disclosure does not provide written basis support to the rejected limitations.

In regard to claims 58, 59, 66, and 67, Applicant argues that Applicant points to FIGs. 5A-5C to support the rejected limitation as being new matter. The pointed to Figures do not provide written basis support said limitations as set forth in the previous Office Action.

Claims 17, 18, 20, 26, 31, 44, 45, 50, 55, 60, 61, 63, and 68-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Gorur et al. (April 2003) (Gorur hereafter).

This rejection is maintained with respect to claims 17, 18, 20, 26, 31, 44, 45, 50, 55, 60, 61, 63, and 68-70, as recited in the previous office action mailed December 05, 2006.

Claims 19, 21-24, 27-30, 32, 46, 48, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorur et al. (April 2003) (Gorur hereafter) as applied to claims 17, 18, 20, 26, 31, 44, 45, 50, 55, 60, 61, 63, and 68-70 above, and further in view of Yin et al. (US 2002/0091539) (Yin hereafter).

This rejection is maintained with respect to claims 19, 21-24, 27-30, 32, 46, 48, and 49, as recited in the previous office action mailed December 05, 2006.

Claims 54 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorur et al. (April 2003) (Gorur hereafter) in view of Yin et al. (US 2002/0091539) (Yin hereafter) as applied to claims 17-24, 2-32, 44-46, 48-50, 55, 60, 61, 63, and 68-70 above, and further in view of Kulkarni (1995).

This rejection is maintained with respect to claims 54 and 62 as recited in the previous office action mailed December 05, 2006.

Continuation of 13. Other: It is noted that claim 51 was inadvertently included in the prior art rejection. Claim 51 has been withdrawn from said prior art rejection. Claims 33 and 51 are objected..